

Highway from Bellingham to Ketchikan with her husband. She didn't know when she accepted the job at the Methodist Church in Ketchikan as copastor that she would be overseeing the day shelter. At first, according to her, the work was a bit unsettling. "I never intentionally walked side by side with people who are homeless," she said. She continued: "Initially, I may have been biased. I was using the word 'them' when I would describe the people I was working with. One day, the Lord said to me, Evelyn, you are them. You are my child no less or no more than they are." She said that after hearing that voice, she realized she wasn't working with "them" anymore. "I was working with men and women who were in a place that I easily could have been."

In her years working to help the homeless in her community in Ketchikan, she realized that not everybody who is homeless fits neatly into "one basket." There are lots of reasons for homelessness, she said, and the homeless may have many, many faces: men, women, children, families, the old, and the young.

As the Presiding Officer knows, homelessness is a big challenge across our Nation. On any given day, tens of thousands of Americans—hundreds of thousands—don't have a permanent place to call home. Of course, the best way to address this is to have a strong economy and job opportunities, and that is what we need to be focusing on here in the Senate. But we also need people like Pastor Evelyn not only in Alaska but across the country, who are tireless advocates for helping the homeless. I thank all of them. I especially thank her, and I thank her for being our Alaskan of the Week.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF HERBERT MCMASTER

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, since coming to office, the President's National Security Council has experienced more turmoil than any in history at this stage in a Presidency. The President's first National Security Advisor and head of the NSC, Michael Flynn, was fired after only a month in his position. The Council itself has been reshaped in ways that concern all of us. Permanent postings for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Director of the National Intelligence Agency have been removed and a permanent seat has been installed for White House Political Adviser Steve Bannon.

This organization is a disturbing and profound departure from past administrations. On the most sensitive matters

of national security, the President should be relying on the informed counsel of members of the intelligence and military communities, not political advisers who made their careers running a White nationalist website.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is the President's primary military adviser and, along with that of the Director of National Intelligence, is the only independent, apolitical voice on the NSC. President Trump's move to strip them of their seats is baffling and potentially endangers our national security. The President has installed in their stead one of the most strident, ideological voices in his orbit.

On the most sensitive issues of national security, we have to have fact-based decisions. The President has to get the most dispassionate and accurate advice. With all due respect, that is not Mr. Bannon's forte. His installation on the principals list of the NSC moves it further away from what it needs to be and closer toward a shadow council of a dangerously ideological West Wing.

The bottom line is, this decision was poorly thought out and ill-conceived. It puts a filter on the information going to the President and will make us less safe. My concerns are shared by Members on both sides of the aisle. I know that from conversations I have had with some.

It has special relevance today because we are about to vote on reappointing H.R. McMaster to lieutenant general, who will be the next head of the NSC. General McMaster, by all accounts, will have a grounding presence in the national security apparatus of the White House. I have met him. I have a great deal of respect for both his integrity and his abilities, but I remain deeply concerned that General McMaster's judgment may not be followed and instead the fevered dreams of Mr. Bannon will influence the most sensitive national security discussions and decisions. It has been reported he doesn't want to see NATO exist or the European Union. Those are political decisions in a body charged with giving the President advice on security.

So this should concern all of us, especially Lieutenant General McMaster.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STRANGE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF NEIL GORSUCH

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, as I did 2 weeks ago and will continue to do until he is confirmed, I rise to support the nomination of Neil Gorsuch to serve on the Supreme Court. Judge Gorsuch is an accomplished, mainstream jurist, and I look forward to helping to make

sure that he receives an up-or-down vote on the Senate floor.

Next week, my colleagues and I on the Judiciary Committee will hold confirmation hearings on Judge Gorsuch. I look forward to hearing his testimony. I am confident that he will impress the country with his knowledge of and respect for the law, just as he has impressed me and my colleagues.

But before the hearings get under way, I thought I would use this opportunity today to highlight an additional aspect of his life and his jurisprudence that make him an ideal nominee to serve on the High Court. So far I have spoken on the floor about his fitness to fill Justice Scalia's seat, as well as his defense of the separation of powers and his support for religious liberty. Today I would like to discuss a more personal aspect of Judge Gorsuch's background—the fact that he is a westerner. As an Arizonan, I cannot overstate how important it will be to have a fellow westerner serving on the Supreme Court.

Where you are from influences your understanding of cultural and regional sensitivities. When you look at the current makeup of the Supreme Court, there is an unmistakable lack of geographic diversity. Of the eight current Justices, five of them were born in New York or New Jersey, and that number was six before Judge Scalia's passing. Granted, Justice Kennedy is from Northern California, but to be frank, much of Northern California is about as culturally western as Justice Breyer's hometown of Boston.

The Supreme Court is in desperate need of a western perspective. Judge Gorsuch fits that bill. When I had the opportunity to meet Judge Gorsuch in my office last month, we discussed our respective western backgrounds. I talked to him about my days growing up on a cattle ranch in rural Arizona. He told me that his heart has always been in the American West. You can learn a lot about a person by how they spend their time with their friends and their family, and there is no mistaking this aspect with Judge Gorsuch. He is a westerner through and through.

He told me about his home outside of Boulder, where his daughters raise and show chickens and goats. I was pleased to learn that each year he takes his law clerks to the National Western Stock Show in Denver, one of the Nation's largest rodeos. By now, I think we have all seen the picture of him fly fishing with Judge Scalia. While all this demonstrates how much he has embraced the western lifestyle, what makes Judge Gorsuch a true westerner is more than just where he lives or where his personal interests are. Judge Gorsuch's western values are evident in his jurisprudence, which reflects a strong commitment to public service. Arizona has had its share of distinguished public servants. In fact, it was from this very desk that the late Barry Goldwater, one of Arizona's favorite sons, steered the public policy debate

for years after he chose to leave a successful career in the private sector. Judge Gorsuch's career reflects the same ethos.

Early on, a young Neil Gorsuch rocketed to the top of the legal profession, becoming a partner in one of Washington's most elite law firms. But instead of enjoying the comforts of a lucrative private sector career, he left it all behind for a high-responsibility, low-profile job at the Department of Justice.

After his time at DOJ, Neil Gorsuch could have easily retired or returned to a white-shoe legal practice. Instead, he returned to his home State of Colorado to serve as a judge on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit. Throughout his tenure on the Federal bench, Judge Gorsuch's western disposition has shone through in his jurisprudence.

I have already spoken of his skepticism toward the administrative state, with its executive bureaucracies, which, he cautions, "swallow huge amounts of core judicial and legislative power and concentrate Federal power in a way that seems more than a little difficult to square with the Constitution of the framers' design."

He shares a healthy skepticism over an overly intrusive and heavy-handed bureaucracy with millions of his Federal westerners. Judge Gorsuch recognizes how Federal regulations interfere with the ability of Western States to govern themselves, whether it is a former administration's Clean Power Plan, its ozone rules, or even management of the Mexican gray wolf.

In numerous opinions, Judge Gorsuch has given voice to many of the frustrations experienced by his western neighbors. From his criticism of an overly assertive DC court that often feels compelled to intervene from 2,000 miles away to his recognition of excessive litigation that arises from the complexities of split-estate property rights out West, he speaks our language.

These are perspectives any westerner is familiar with, but they may not be obvious to others, including folks from New York and New Jersey. If confirmed, Judge Gorsuch will already bring generational and religious diversity to the Court. Perhaps more than anything, it will be his western perspective that most enriches the debate in the years to come.

As I have said before, Judge Gorsuch deserves fair consideration by those who serve in this body, and he deserves an up-or-down vote on the Senate floor. He should be confirmed overwhelmingly, and I am confident that he will be.

Joining us on the floor today are several members of the Senate from Western States. I see that the Senator from Wyoming has joined us. I think he has some thoughts about Neil Gorsuch and his nomination to the Court.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, joining my colleague here on the floor, I

agree with all of the comments the Senator from Arizona has made. They are interesting because as to the history of the State of the Senator from Arizona and his family history, Judge Gorsuch has a similar history, to the point that his great-grandfather built a hotel in Wyoming called the Wolf Hotel, in Saratoga, WY. I found a picture of that hotel from 1878, which was 12 years before Wyoming became a State. I got that picture from the American history museum at the University of Wyoming and got a copy of the picture and gave it to Judge Gorsuch.

In front of the hotel in 1878, there was a stagecoach with six horses lined up ahead of it. The Wolf Hotel was a halfway stop on the stagecoach line between a couple of communities in Wyoming. They were about 40 miles apart. So that is the heritage from which Judge Gorsuch comes.

I think that western heritage is important. But I think that additionally important is what the Senator referred to—his judicial temperament, being such a mainstream member of the judiciary, and this general belief inherent within him that the role of a judge is to apply the law, not to legislate from the bench.

We have seen so much legislating from the bench. I think you just don't get that if you take somebody from the Rocky Mountain West who has this view of the Nation and an understanding of the rule of law and the Constitution.

So I think we are going to see that when the Senate Judiciary Committee begins its hearings next week on Judge Gorsuch's nomination to the Supreme Court. I visited with him, reviewed his writings, and then compared it to what I saw when I visited with Justice Scalia when he came to Wyoming. The Senator from Arizona mentioned the picture of the two working together, fishing together.

I just think he is the right person to continue that incredible legacy of Justice Scalia.

Mr. FLAKE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARRASSO. Yes.

Mr. FLAKE. You point out the sensitivities that you have when you come from the West. A lot of it has to do with, if you are in a rural area in particular, you are—as my family grew up—working on the land. Much of that land is either owned by or controlled by the Federal Government, the State government, or Tribal governments in Arizona's case. In fact, 85 percent of the State of Arizona is publicly owned. So when you live in the West and you work the land on a ranch or farm, you are dealing specifically with Federal regulators and Federal property managers. I think those who were raised in the West and have lived here understand the impact of the Federal Government's decisions. The administrative state has an outsized impact on those who live in the West, and I think that is evident in the jurisprudence you see from Judge Gorsuch.

How much of Wyoming is publicly owned?

Mr. BARRASSO. Well, it is about 50-50. But when you talk about the heavy hand of a bureaucratic government and the impact on the lives of the people who live there, it is dramatic. It can be very punishing, as we have seen over the last 8 years with regulations that have come out of agencies—sometimes, I believe, in defiance of the law, sometimes reversed by the Supreme Court.

That is why I think it is critical to have Neil Gorsuch on the Supreme Court, because he is someone who realizes that the Constitution is a legal document—not a living document, not built for flexibility, but really a rigid legal document. That is where I believe he stands. That is what his writings indicate. It is the sort of thing we have seen from him. I visited with him, and other Members have. These are the things we read about.

With regard to his writings over the years, this is a judge who has faithfully applied the law—applied the law, focusing on the Constitution. He has not been afraid to rule against the government or for unpopular parties when the law demands it because he is going to go right back to the law. I believe his opinions show great reverence for all of the Constitution—a key respect for the importance of the separation of powers.

I support his nomination completely. It is interesting, because when he was nominated for the position he currently holds, the Democratic Senator from Colorado—and I am expecting Senator CORY GARDNER to be here in a little bit to talk about the quote from Ken Salazar, the former Senator from Colorado, who talked about what a wonderful man Judge Gorsuch was and how he should be put onto that bench. He was unanimously confirmed here in the Senate.

I have full confidence in Judge Gorsuch as a son of the West, as the only Justice from the Rocky Mountain West who would be on the Court. Specifically, though, I would support him no matter where he was from because of his belief that it is the role of a judge and a justice to apply the law, not to legislate from the bench, which I think goes above and beyond where someone is from, what their background may be. But I will just tell you that his background, combined with his philosophy and mainstream approach to the law, is exactly what we need now in 2017 on the U.S. Supreme Court. I believe he deserves an up-or-down vote. I believe he will be confirmed as people get a chance to see him, get to know him better.

I see I am joined on the floor by another colleague, also from the Rocky Mountain West, the Senator from Montana. You have heard from Arizona, Wyoming, and now Montana. I would ask him about his thoughts about this nomination by President Trump of Neil Gorsuch to the Supreme Court.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I want to thank my esteemed colleague from Wyoming, Senator BARRASSO, for his comments. He shared many of the same views I have.

As I think about the job I do as a Senator—perhaps one of the most important jobs we have as Senators is approving a Supreme Court Justice. An Associate Justice of the Supreme Court can serve an average of 27 years. We think about Justice Scalia; he served 30 years. Neil Gorsuch is 49 years old. God willing, he probably will serve 30 years or more, perhaps. Think about that. My wife and I have four children. They are going through the college years and so forth. They are in their early and midtwenties. They will likely be grandparents when Judge Gorsuch wraps up his career on the Supreme Court, assuming he is approved. That is why a decision like this about whom to vote for, whom to stand behind, whom to stand with is so important. It is not just for today, it is for our children and our grandchildren.

The people want a Supreme Court Justice who does not legislate from the bench. The people want a Supreme Court Justice who upholds the rule of law and follows the Constitution. The people want a Supreme Court Justice with a record of constitutional jurisprudence and legal restraint to match what we saw from Justice Antonin Scalia. The people want a Supreme Court Justice with the academic credentials, who is well prepared to serve the American people on our highest Court, to wrestle with some of the most complicated issues that the High Court wrestles with.

When President Trump announced that he was appointing Judge Neil Gorsuch to the U.S. Supreme Court, the American people knew he was truly a supreme pick. He has a brilliant legal mind. He understands the role a judge plays in our judicial system—to interpret the law and not to legislate from the bench. In fact, on the night he was announced, when President Trump revealed his pick, I was at the White House, and I heard Judge Gorsuch say: “A judge who likes every outcome he reaches is very likely a bad judge, stretching for results he prefers rather than those the law demands.” That is the humility of a great judge.

Judge Gorsuch has impeccable legal qualifications that demonstrate he will be the type of Justice every American deserves to have on the highest Court. He graduated from Harvard Law School. He was a Harry Truman Scholar, graduated with honors in 1991. He earned his law degree and then attended Oxford University as a Marshall Scholar and received his doctorate degree in 2004 from Oxford.

As we say out West, and as a Montanan, I have to say I am thrilled to see somebody from Colorado be nominated for the Supreme Court. We say out West: Go get a good education and then get over it. And he brings that kind of humility to the bench. He un-

derstands that he is beneath the law, he is subject to the law. He is there to interpret the law, not to make the law.

He clerked for Justice Byron White. He clerked for Justice Kennedy of the Supreme Court of the United States. In fact, in 2006, Judge Gorsuch was nominated by then-President Bush to the Tenth Circuit in Denver, CO. He was confirmed without any opposition, including the support of 11 current Democratic Senators. In fact, some of those Democrats included Harvard Law classmate Barack Obama, Vice President Joe Biden, and the current minority leader, CHUCK SCHUMER. During his time as a judge on the Tenth Circuit, he has built a solid reputation as a respected jurist with a very distinguished record.

One thing about serving on the Tenth Circuit Court for 10 years: You can run, but you can't hide. He has left a track record. It is an impressive track record. It is a consistent record of defending the Constitution, including respecting the separation of powers and respecting federalism and the Bill of Rights to protect every American from government overreach and government abuse.

When I had the opportunity to sit down with Judge Gorsuch, it was back in early February. We spoke about the role of government and federalism. We spoke about the Second Amendment. We spoke about protecting life and upholding our civil liberties. We spoke about our shared western values, mine as a native Montanan, his as a native Coloradan, both of us westerners. I know he understands our way of life. He understands Montana values. In fact, his face lit up as we talked about the love of the outdoors and his passion for hiking and fishing.

As chairman of the Western Caucus, it is important to me to have someone who understands western values, someone who understands the impact the law and his decisions will have on the West.

As westerners, we fight to protect our Fourth Amendment rights. We champion federalism so that power not expressly given to the Federal Government in the Constitution is returned back to the States and to the people. We will tirelessly fight to protect the Second Amendment. These are western values.

By the way, the Second Amendment is not primarily about hunting. Our Founding Fathers were not thinking about deer hunting or elk hunting when they were discussing the Second Amendment. It was about liberty. It was about freedom. These are western values. Judge Gorsuch's background and record strongly suggest that he recognizes and adheres to these values. He will uphold the law. He will rightfully check the administration and Congress when their actions are not done under the law, like President Obama's EPA power plan or the WOTUS rule. These are actions that cripple western economies, and they are politically charged.

I would also like to mention that Senator CORY GARDNER of Colorado and I were just at the White House meeting, just an hour ago. We were at the White House meeting with over a dozen Tribes who represent hundreds of other Tribes. We were there to discuss our support for Neil Gorsuch to be a Supreme Court Justice. I can tell you, it was great to be there with one of my hometown Tribes from Montana, the CSKT. They have endorsed Neil Gorsuch. They understand that we need a mainstream, commonsense westerner on the Supreme Court.

By the way, when you look at Neil Gorsuch's record on Indian Country issues, as a member of the Tenth Circuit Court for 10 years, he has a track record of ruling on some very complicated issues that face Indian Country. He understands sovereignty. That is very important. That is why you are seeing Tribes endorsing Judge Gorsuch.

More importantly, the American people deserve nine members on the Supreme Court. Neil Gorsuch is the mainstream judge the American people want and deserve to fill out the Court.

I am looking forward to what will happen next week in those hearings. You are going to see a very, very bright, a very, very thoughtful, a very, very kind, and a very, very humble jurist who understands and upholds the rule of law. I am excited for our country that we have such a phenomenal nominee. I look forward to casting my vote to confirm him to the highest Court in our great country.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation right now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is considering the Coats nomination.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I understand that we will be voting in about 10 minutes; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct, sir.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I have had the great honor and privilege of knowing the nominee to be our Director of National Intelligence for many years. In fact, I came to the House of Representatives in the election of 1984, and I had the honor of knowing Dan Coats beginning at that time.

As is well known, Dan Coats left the Senate and became our Ambassador to Germany, where he did an outstanding job. He came back to the U.S. Senate and served in this body with distinction and honor. Now he goes on to serve as the Director of National Intelligence.

I could argue that a dedicated, experienced, knowledgeable, and courageous Director of National Intelligence

is now needed more than at any time that I can remember in the last many years.

With divisions within the intelligence community, there are challenges to the credibility of the intelligence community along the lines that I have never seen. There are questions about the activities of the intelligence community. For example, the President of the United States alleges that Trump Tower was "wiretapped," in his words, by the previous administration, and we see the former Director of National Intelligence both before the Congress and on national television stating that those allegations are not true.

There are probably more questions and more controversy surrounding our intelligence services than at any time since anyone can remember, since Watergate. So this is a perfect time, in my view, for Dan Coats to assume the highest responsibilities of our Director of National Intelligence. He has the respect and indeed affection of Members on both sides of the aisle because of his successful efforts at working in a bipartisan fashion. He served on the Intelligence Committee. He served on that committee in a very dedicated and knowledgeable fashion.

I hope my colleagues will unanimously vote in favor of our former colleague. Both sides of the aisle know him, and we know him well. I wish I had some of his qualities of congeniality and pleasantry. He has always been respectful of other views. Even in the fiercest debates that we might have, he has always been respectful of those who disagree. So he comes to the job with the much needed credibility that will make him immediately effective.

Let's be frank. The intelligence communities are probably under greater attack in a whole variety of ways, both on whether the American people trust them to do the job that they are doing or whether they have become a partisan organization. I think that with the respect and appreciation and affection that those of us who had the privilege of knowing him—on both sides of the aisle—and knowing what an honorable and decent person he is, he will not only serve as an effective Director of National Intelligence, but he will serve to restore credibility.

God knows we need credibility at this time, as we see the Russians trying to affect the outcome of our election, as we see today the Russians trying to affect the French election and possibly the German election, as we see unprecedented cyber attacks—more than at any time in the past. With the challenge of cyber alone, where our adversaries or our potential adversaries are equal to or even, in some cases, more capable of exercising their abilities and capabilities in the cyber realm, then we are in a very difficult and challenging struggle.

That is why I think that many times in history, not only does the man make the job but the job makes the man. I

am confident, in the case of Senator Dan Coats, that will be the case.

I thank the Democratic leader for allowing this vote to take place so Dan Coats can get to work immediately.

I urge my colleagues to offer their support with their vote for this nomination of a great and good and gentle man who has again volunteered to serve his Nation, for which all of us should be appreciative, and I am sure we are.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Coats nomination?

Mr. BARRASSO. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER), and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "yea" and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER) would have voted "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 85, nays 12, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 89 Ex.]

YEAS—85

Barrasso	Franken	Nelson
Bennet	Gardner	Perdue
Blumenthal	Graham	Peters
Blunt	Grassley	Portman
Boozman	Hassan	Reed
Brown	Hatch	Risch
Burr	Heinrich	Roberts
Cantwell	Heitkamp	Rounds
Capito	Heller	Rubio
Cardin	Hirono	Sasse
Carper	Hoeven	Schatz
Casey	Inhofe	Schumer
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott
Cochran	Kaine	Shahen
Coons	Kennedy	Shelby
Cornyn	King	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Klobuchar	Strange
Cotton	Lankford	Sullivan
Crapo	Leahy	Tester
Cruz	Lee	Thune
Daines	Manchin	Tillis
Donnelly	McCain	Toomey
Durbin	McCaskill	Van Hollen
Enzi	McConnell	Warner
Ernst	Menendez	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Moran	Wicker
Fischer	Murkowski	Young
Flake	Murphy	
	Murray	

NAYS—12

Baldwin	Harris	Sanders
Booker	Markey	Udall
Duckworth	Merkley	Warren
Gillibrand	Paul	Wyden

NOT VOTING—3

Alexander	Corker	Isakson
-----------	--------	---------

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF HERBERT MCMASTER

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to render an "aye" vote for the nomination of Herbert McMaster to remain in active duty at the three-star level. He is experienced. He is talented. He knows what it is like to be in combat with the enemy, and I believe he is badly needed in this important position.

I urge my colleagues to render an "aye" vote.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Lt. Gen. Herbert R. McMaster, Jr., to be Lieutenant General in the United States Army while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the cloture motion is withdrawn.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the McMaster nomination?

Mr. TOOMEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER), and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "yea," the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) would have voted "yea," and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER) would have voted "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 86, nays 10, as follows: